Dateline September 1, 1960

This special edition of CONTACT-CONCERN is devoted to the issues which surround the coming national elections, with the exception of the following Dateline copy which comments on current activities in Congress. However, these, too, relate directly to matters of Christian concern which are interwoven in the current political battle.

In an election year, it is not always easy to see Christian responsibilities clearly, especially in so close a race as is before us. This issue of CONTACT-CONCERN is offered as a guide for discussion and to assist in analysis and preparation for participation in the national elections.
—R. B.

Right now, it looks close in November. The only member of either camp who is thinking, or at least talking otherwise, is Gov. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, a Kennedy lieutenant. Ribicoff says the election will be a landslide, one way or the other.

Kennedy seems to have the edge at this time. He doesn't have the traditionally-Democratic South wrapped up yet, but he has a big lead over Nixon. The Republicans, however, have made real inroads in the South. If the election were held tomorrow, Nixon would probably carry Florida, Oklahoma, Virginia and perhaps Texas, despite Senator Johnson's place on the Democratic ticket.

Adding to the regular Democrat's troubles in the South is the fact that several Southern leaders have not yet spoken out in support of the Kennedy-Johnson ticket. Included in the group remaining silent are such men as Sen. Harry F. Byrd (D-Va.) and Sen. Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.). While Southerners in the Senate may be holding out in order to place a club over the head of the Democratic nominees to prevent them from riding too high and fancy in the current

(continued on page 2)

CHAS. HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION
1798 SCENIC AVE.
BERKELEY 9, CALIF.
C 4 61

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

CONTACT CONCERN

a service of the
GENERAL BOARD OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONCERNS
OF THE METHODIST CHURCH
- Division of Temperance and General Welfare
- Division of Peace and World Order
- Division of Human Relations and Economic Affairs

CONTACT CONCERN

a service of the
GENERAL BOARD OF
CHRISTIAN SOCIAL CONCERNS
OF THE METHODIST CHURCH

- DIVISION OF TEMPERANCE AND GENERAL WELFARE
- DIVISION OF PEACE AND WORLD ORDER
- DIVISION OF HUMAN RELATIONS AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

THE METHODIST BUILDING
100 MARYLAND AVENUE, NORTHEAST
WASHINGTON 2, D.C. LINCOLN 6-1000

Vol. 2, No. 16 Sept. 1, 1960

Editor: Roger Burgess

Contributing Editors:
John L. Bryan, Emogene Dunlap, Caradine R. Hooton, Robert Regan, Emerson Smith, Carl Soule, Daniel E. Taylor, A. Dudley Ward, Herman Will

Assistant Editor:
Marilyn M. Baldwin

Circulation Manager:
Sam Griffin

Contact-Concern is issued twice each month by the General Board of Christian Social Concerns of The Methodist Church.

Contact-Concern is a member of The Associated Church Press.

Editorial Offices are in The Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, Northeast, Washington 2, D. C.

Advertising rates and information are available from Editorial Offices, 100 Maryland Avenue, Northeast, Washington 2, D. C.

Subscription Price is $3.00 per year in advance. Single copies are 35¢ each. Write to Service Department, 100 Maryland Avenue, Northeast, Washington 2, D. C. Air mail edition, $9.00 per year, U. S. only.

Change of address information should be sent with both old and new addresses to Service Department, 100 Maryland Avenue, Northeast, Washington 2, D. C.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

5

Dateline

(continued from page 1)

special session of Congress, the delay and indecision adds fuel to Republican fires.

Both Republicans and Democrats are working hard now to register new voters for the November elections. They estimate there are 25 to 30 million people across the country of voting age, but not registered. Some say the success or failure of these registration drives will provide the margin of victory in November.

Registered Democrats now outnumber registered Republicans by the millions. And no registration drive by the Republicans, no matter how well organized, could possibly even the odds by November.

This gives Nixon a built-in handicap in the Presidential sweepstakes. He must not only have GOP votes, but will have to woo and win a large part of the substantial independent vote.

Kennedy has his problems too, however. Perhaps the paramount one is the "religious issue." Right now, Kennedy's religion is an asset, not a liability. The latest Gallup Poll found that "the nation's Catholic voters—with a substantial majority supporting Senator Kennedy—are showing more interest in the election than Protestants are."

The problem is what may happen when it becomes generally apparent that there will be a large Catholic vote for him because he is Catholic. Kennedy's worry: will non-Catholics move to counter the Catholic vote? He plans to meet the issue by emphasizing over and over that he "hopes no one will vote for him or against him because he is Catholic."

Congress is back in session and it's politics as usual, only more so. The temptation to look ahead to November rather than concentrate on the business at hand has proven overwhelming. The major fireworks have centered in the Senate with three of the four nominees for national office present and accounted for.

Senate Democrats are concentrating on driving through two measures which they feel are "must" items in this election year. The prestige of the Democratic ticket, both halves of which have leadership roles in the Senate, depends upon the success of the drive.

The first item is an increase in the minimum wage. Senator Kennedy is the author of the Democrat's bill which would increase the wage from $1 to $1.25 an hour. The Administration favors an increase of only $1.15, the figure contained in the House-passed bill. It is expected that the Senate-approved bill will be more liberal than the House version, but something less than the original Kennedy proposal.

Another "must" bill for the current session would provide medical care for the aged. The Senate Finance committee has approved a bill which follows the bill passed by the House in late June. The Senate bill is modified, however, to make it more attractive to the states. It junks the Forand bill approach of adding medical aid to the Social Security program, an approach to which liberal Democrats are wed. Instead, it favors state programs helped by Federal funds.

To make it more attractive to the states, the Senate bill would increase the Federal share of costs to a possible maximum of 80 per cent for poor states. The House ceiling was 65 per cent.

Sen. John F. Kennedy, Democratic Presidential nominee, has blasted the Senate Committee bill and promised to wage a floor fight to add medical care to the Social Security program. His running mate, Sen. Lyndon Johnson has backed Kennedy's position and said the Senate should work out a "pay-as-you-go plan," tied to the Social Security program. It is expected that the Committee bill will be liberally amended on the floor of the Senate.

Christian Responsibility in an Election Year

A resolution adopted by the General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Feb. 25, 1960.

The American people, during 1960, will hold a presidential election designed to entrust the power of government into those hands chosen by the people to administer our national affairs on the basis of a decision arrived at through the vigorous debate of the political campaign. But the truly awesome issues of this time will not be faced by the people of the United States unless we arouse ourselves from our political lethargy and take full responsibility for the policy decisions which our nation must make. Only the citizens can bring about the vigorous and thoughtful discussion of issues which will make the election worthy of the democratic process. Through this message the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. speaks to its member churches and through them to all Americans about the political responsibility all citizens bear in this election.

Concern of all the people

The political campaign now in process will involve four decisive stages: the drafting of party platforms, the nomination of candidates, the appeal for votes and the casting of ballots. At each stage of this national campaign and in all state and local elections the individuals in our churches have the right and the duty to be heard. Political endeavor is ennobled when it is subjected to the test of conscience. The God of our fathers continues to call us to seek and do his will in our public life. Christians must fulfill this role to the end that the political struggle upon which the country is embarking will strengthen the ramparts of freedom at home, add to the moral stature of our nation, and contribute to constructive political, economic and social developments among the peoples of the world.

The ways in which we, as citizens, face these questions are manifold. In addition to our vote at the polls, the normal contacts of our daily life affect public thought and decision. In mealtime discussions, in our conversations with friends and colleagues, in working associations, in social and fraternal societies, we have the opportunity to clarify our own thinking and that of others. Through individuals and groups we can help to create a public climate of integrity and search for truth at a time when great decisions are hanging in the balance.

It is the responsibility of political leaders in the forthcoming nominating conventions to define the guiding principles and state the specific policies upon which their respective candidates will stand for election, and which the parties intend to carry out. The official pronouncements of the churches in the area of social action are relevant to the issues that are dealt with in party platforms. People have the responsibility to inquire concerning the bearing of a candi-

(continued on page 4)

(continued from page 3)

date's religious views upon his decisions in public office. It is the responsibility of the members of our churches to vigorously oppose appeals to religious bigotry as a factor in elections. Voting should be based primarily upon a candidate's personal integrity, his leadership competence and his stand on central issues.

Responsibility of the churches

Christians seek to build a responsible society, one where freedom is the freedom of men who acknowledge responsibility to justice and public order, and where those who hold political authority or economic power are responsible for its exercise to God and the people whose welfare is affected by it.

With respect to domestic policy, churches both individually and through the National Council of Churches have worked closely with public agencies in improving the social welfare of our people. While the churches are aware of unresolved problems of human relationships within their own lives, nevertheless corporately and through their members they have supported efforts to preserve and extend civil rights and civil liberties to all groups in our population, to extend the voting franchise to all qualified citizens irrespective of race, to achieve equality of opportunity for all, and to assure equal protection to all before the law. They have sought to uphold religious liberty. They have spoken and acted against racial discrimination and have supported the decisions of the Supreme Court outlawing segregation in the public schools and elsewhere. They have sought to enunciate and to help implement Christian principles of conduct in relationships between management and labor.

With respect to foreign policy, the churches have urged the United States to accept more fully its responsibilities as a member of the family of nations and to strive by every honorable means to establish peace and justice upon the earth.

They have affirmed the necessity for an untrammeled exchange of ideas through speaking, teaching, preaching, assembling, voting, and the press and other mass media of communication. They have sought to improve the standards of ethical conduct in political activity and public office.

Believing that the will of God should be sought for all areas of life, the churches have tried to discover His will and obey it in the area of public responsibility. They have engaged in studies of our civic and political life in an effort to give greater guidance to the churches and to Christian individuals in the principles of Christian public action. They believe that these principles mentioned above, considered on the basis of their inherent merit will commend themselves to our fellow Americans as being in the highest national interest.

The foregoing are among the policies approved by our churches through the National Council of Churches, policies which we commend to all voters and to those responsible for the nomination of candidates and the drafting of party platforms. Members of churches are urged to restudy these issues and to communicate their convictions to party leaders and candidates for office.

Campaign standards

It is right and proper that U. S. policy, domestic and foreign, be vigorously debated during the weeks ahead. This debate should not proceed, however, along the line of sectional, racial, religious or class divisions. We are one people. Our national unity, despite partisan rivalries, is indispensable to our survival as a free people. To set class against class, or religion against religion, or race against race, is a vicious practice and repugnant to all honorable Americans. The well-being of our people at home, and the position of the United States in the eyes of the world transcend the partisan fortunes of any candidate. In their appeal for votes candidates for public office should act with forthright integrity and disdain all forms of demagoguery. Citizens should hold the candidates responsible for their conduct of the campaign and work to insure that there is no resort to intimidation or bribery, direct or indirect. The honor and prestige of our nation must not be thrown to the winds of irresponsible political disputation.

Political action

Not the candidates alone, but the people as a whole, should participate intelligently in the discussion of public issues. This should be true in relation to all areas of debate—local, state and national. If our democracy is to flourish, the people must participate in the making of policy. All potential voters in the population should be encouraged to register (even if a poll tax is a prerequisite).

The final stage of the election campaign will be reached on Nov. 8 when the people go to the polls. A free and secret ballot is one of the treasured rights of U. S. citizenship, that should be carefully exercised by every qualified voter in elections both with respect to the least conspicuous local office and to the Presidency.

This nation under God

It is our fervent prayer that in the exercise of their franchise the voters of our country will prove worthy of their heritage as a free people under God. It would be a disaster, if, in this time of decision, political loyalties were not governed by considerations of truth, justice and righteousness. We recognize that political parties are essential to the democratic process of this nation, but of greater importance than the victory of a particular political party at the polls in November is the victory that will be shared by all people if decisions are made that will strengthen the foundations of freedom and enhance the prospects for peace and justice throughout the world.

Party platforms

While some have used the words "tweedledee and tweedledum" in comparing them, there are some real differences between the 1960 platforms of the Democrats and Republicans.

In sheer volume, the Democrat's 20,000 word effort, out-talks the Republican offering. This is in line with Democratic promises to "do more" than the Republicans. The Republicans, on the other hand counter with the claim that their's is the more realistic of the two platforms, the more likely to be achieved.

The fact is, of course, that both platforms feature something for everybody, and this belies one of the basic facts of life regarding political platforms. Platforms are written for use in Presidential campaigns. They are designed to cater to as many special interests and voting blocs as possible.

Fulfilling the promises after election is often a horse of a different hue. Platforms versus performances in the past would seem to illustrate that too often politicians, unlike the symbol of one of the parties, possess very short memories. But the problem is not quite that simple. It merely leads one to a second fact of life about political platforms.

Party platforms are, for the most part, written by people who are not in a position to do anything about implementing them. A platform depends for its execution upon the election of a President and a Congress that see eye to eye. It consists mainly of proposals for legislation that will be meaningless unless there is Congressional action. And very few of those who drafted the 1960 platforms are, or ever will be, members of the Congress.

Proposals thwarted

Some of the key pledges in both 1956 platforms involved legislative proposals that have been thwarted in

Congress by a coalition of conservative Democrats and Republicans. There is every reason to believe that this coalition will continue to operate effectively no matter who wins the Presidential election.

Nevertheless, platforms do set down basic philosophy and principles of the parties, and constitute a standard against which to measure their performances. Moreover, though some black marks persist, action in keeping with platform promises has improved in recent years. They are therefore, worth reviewing, and comparing.

Such a comparison can, for the Christian citizen, be a very interesting exercise.

For some the differences between the platforms may be a question of "paying your money and taking your choice." For others, the question will be a little more difficult, a lot more important.

The following comparison of specific planks from each of the platforms together with the "position" of the church as taken from official policy statements of The Methodist Church and the National Council of Churches is intended to be helpful to those who are interested in making such a comparison.

Contact-Concern readers are urged, however, to read the full text of both party platforms for 1960. Copies may be obtained by writing The Republican National Committee, 1625 Eye Street, Northwest, and the Democratic National Committee, 1737 L Street, Northwest, both in Washington, D. C.

For the complete text of applicable policy statements adopted by the 1960 General Conference of The Methodist Church, see *Contact*, June 1, 1960.

Comparison of selected platform planks

Democratic

(Excerpts from "The Rights of Man," the 1960 Democratic Platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention, July 12, 1960, at Los Angeles, Calif.)

Church

(Except where otherwise noted, excerpts are taken from policy statements adopted by the 1960 General Conference of The Methodist Church, April 27-May 7, 1960, at Denver, Colo.)

Republican

(Excerpts from "Building a Better America," the 1960 Republican Platform adopted by the Republican National Convention, July 27, 1960, at Chicago, Ill.)

FOREIGN POLICY

Disarmament and Nuclear Testing

Democratic

A primary task is to develop responsible proposals that will help break the deadlock on arms control.

Such proposals should include means for ending nuclear tests under workable safeguards, cutting back nuclear weapons, reducing conventional forces, preserving outer space for peaceful purposes, preventing surprise attack and limiting the risk of accidental war.

This requires a national peace agency for disarmament planning and research to muster the scientific ingenuity, coordination, continuity and seriousness of purpose which are now lacking in our arms control efforts.

Church

. . . our objective must be nothing less than the abolition of the use of war by nations. Mere arms reductions or limitations are inadequate. Only complete disarmament, involving both nuclear and conventional weapons, down to the levels required for internal policing will deprive nations of the tools of war.

We call upon the United States and all other governments to declare complete, universal and enforceable disarmament to be their goal and to move in this direction.

Such complete disarmament must be universal to be acceptable to all nations. It must be enforced by a competent international agency, preferably a strengthened United Nations. Complete, universal disarmament needs to be based upon confidence in the enforcement system.

Negotiations must be pressed with all major powers to find an acceptable path to disarmament.

We urge permanent cessation of all nuclear tests by all nuclear powers, present and future, in order that present and future generations may be protected from the dangers of nuclear radiation.

Republican

We are . . . ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament, and for the suspension of nuclear tests. We advocate an early agreement by all nations to forego nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and the suspension of other tests as verification techniques permit. We support the President in any decision he may make to re-evaluate the question of resumption of underground nuclear explosions testing, if the Geneva Conference fails to produce a satisfactory agreement.

World Economic Development

Democratic

. . . the new Democratic administration will revamp and refocus the objectives, emphasis and allocation of our foreign assistance programs.

The proper purpose of these programs is not to buy gratitude or to recruit mercenaries, but to enable the people of these awakening, developing nations to make their own free choices.

We shall place our programs of international cooperation on a long-term basis to permit more effective planning. We shall seek to associate other capital exporting countries with us in promoting the orderly economic growth of the underdeveloped world.

The Democratic Administration will recognize that assistance to these countries is not an emergency or short-term matter. Through the Development Loan fund and otherwise, we shall seek to assure continuity in our aid programs for periods of at least five years, to permit more effective allocation on our part and better planning by the governments of the counties receiving aid.

We will use our own agricultural productivity as an effective tool of foreign aid, and also as a vital form of working capital for economic development. We shall seek new approaches which will provide assistance without disrupting normal world markets for food and fiber.

Church

We believe that economic assistance, which seeks to make the benefits of scientific advance and industrial progress available for the improvement of underdeveloped areas is an example of both Christian love and practical international brotherhood.

We sincerely acknowledge the liberal contribution of the United States and other countries for food and other material resources together with technical assistance to benefit the underdeveloped areas of the world.

A bold new step forward is called for at the point of aiding the nations in Asia, Africa and South America. We support the plan of a world economic development authority in the United Nations to which the developed nations of the world would contribute at least one per cent of their gross national income.

All programs of technical assistance and economic aid should be designed to benefit the peoples of underdeveloped countries and their economies rather than to serve political or military purposes. For maximum effectiveness, it is important that these programs be on a long-range basis.

Republican

We recognize that upon our support of well-conceived programs of economic cooperation among nations rest the best hopes of hundreds of millions of friendly people for a decent future for themselves and their children. Our mutual security program of economic help and technical assistance; the Development Loan fund, the Inter-American Bank, the International Development association and the Food for Peace program, which create the conditions for progress in less developed countries; our leadership in international efforts to help children, eliminate pestilence and disease and aid refugees—these are programs wise in concept and generous in purpose. We mean to continue in support of them.

Now we propose a further evolution of our programs for assistance to and cooperation with other nations, suitable to the emerging needs of the future.

We will encourage the countries of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Asia, to initiate appropriate regional groupings to work out plans for economic and educational development.

We would emphasize the increasing use of private capital and government loans, rather than outright grants, as a means of fostering independence and mutual respect.

World Trade

World trade is more than ever essential to world peace. In the tradition of Cordell Hull, we shall expand world trade in every responsible way.

Since all Americans share the benefits of this policy, its costs should not be the burden of a few.

Industries and communities affected by foreign trade need and deserve appropriate help through trade adjustment measures such as direct loans, tax incentives, defense contracts priority and retraining assistance.

The new Democratic Administration will seek international agreements to assure fair competition and fair labor standards to protect our own workers and to improve the lot of workers elsewhere.

The Methodist Church reaffirms its support of Reciprocal Trade agreements and commends the Congress of the United States for having extended them in 1958 for four years.

We believe that the executive branch of the government should be given greater latitude in the negotiation of trade agreements and that the Reciprocal Trade agreements act expiring in 1962 should be renewed for a period of not less than five years.

We urge the Senate to support further the principle of international cooperation through trade by ratifying the treaty which would make our nation a member of the Organization for Trade Cooperation (O.T.C.)

Carrying forward, under the Trade agreements act, the policy of gradual selective—and truly reciprocal—reduction of unjustifiable barriers to trade among free nations. We advocate effective administration of the act's escape clause and peril point provisions to safeguard American jobs and domestic industries against serious injury. In support of our national trade policy we should continue the Eisenhower-Nixon program of using this government's negotiating powers to open markets abroad and to eliminate remaining discrimination against our goods. We should also encourage the development of fair labor standards in exporting countries in the interest of fair competition in international trade.

The United Nations

To all our fellow members of the United Nations: We shall strengthen our commitments in this, our great continuing institution for conciliation and the growth of a world community.

Through the machinery of the United Nations, we shall work for disarmament, the establishment of an international police force, the strengthening of the World Court and the establishment of world law.

We shall propose the bolder and more effective use of the specialized agencies to promote the world's economic and social development.

We believe there is continuing and urgent need to use more fully the various agencies of international understanding and cooperation which are presently available in the United Nations. We believe the United Nations and its agencies should be supported, strengthened and improved. Moreover, if these facilities are to become most effective the United Nations with membership open to all nations, must be given sufficient authority to enact, interpret and enforce world law against aggression and war.

We call upon the government of the United States to expand its leadership in an effort to bring about such charter revisions as are necessary to facilitate the work of the United Nations in maintaining international order and in preventing the outbreak of war.

To nullify the Soviet conspiracy is our greatest task. The United States faces this challenge, and resolves to meet it with courage and confidence.

To this end we will continue to support and strengthen the United Nations as an instrument for peace, for international cooperation and for the advancement of the fundamental freedoms and humane interests of mankind.

Under the United Nations we will work for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, and the extension of the rule of law in the world.

Communist China

We deeply regret that the policies and actions of the government of Communist China have interrupted the generations of friendship between the Chinese and American peoples.

We reaffirm our pledge of determined opposition to the present admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

Although normal diplomatic relations between our governments are impossible under present conditions, we shall welcome any evidence that the Chinese Communist government is genuinely prepared to create a new relationship based on respect for international obligations, including the release of American prisoners.

We will continue to make every effort to effect the release of American citizens and servicemen now unjustly imprisoned in Communist China and elsewhere in the Communist empire.

The Christian religion stands in direct opposition to materialistic ideologies prevalent in many places in the world. These ideologies, with their disregard for human rights, their scorn for the dignity of the individual and their failure to acknowledge the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, are abhorrent to basic Christian principles.

The peace of God cannot be contained within any one nation, economic system or religion. To be a stable and lasting reality it must become universal.

No one nation or group of nations, pitted against other nations, can initiate or maintain world peace. It can only be the result of understanding, forbearance and cooperation on the part of all nations.

Negotiations must be pressed with all major powers to find an acceptable path to disarmament.

We believe the United Nations and its agencies should be supported, strengthened and improved. Moreover, if these facilities are to become most effective the United Nations with membership open to all nations, must be given sufficient authority to enact, interpret and enforce world law against aggression and war.

Recognition of Communist China and its admission to the United Nations have been firmly opposed by the Republican Administration. We will continue in this opposition because of compelling evidence that to do otherwise would weaken the cause of freedom and endanger the future of the free peoples of Asia and the world. The brutal suppression of the human rights and the religious traditions of the Tibetan people is an unhappy evidence of the need to persist in our policy.

Democratic

Church

Republican

World Court

The United States' adherence to the World Court contains a so-called "self-judging reservation" which, in effect, permits us to prevent a Court decision in any particular case in which we are involved. The Democratic Party proposes its repeal.

We support the greater use of the International Court of Justice and urge the United States to lead the way in removing restrictions which impair the Court's effectiveness.

(The Republican Platform is silent on this matter.)

Military Assistance

Where military assistance remains essential for the common defense, we shall see that the requirements are fully met. But as rapidly as security considerations permit, we will replace tanks with tractors, bombers with bulldozers and tacticians with technicians.

We tend to think too much in terms of military posture, with economic assistance closely related to it. Political, cultural and economic relationships must be given higher priority. *(Excerpt from "Toward a Family of Nations Under God" a policy statement adopted by The General Board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., June 2, 1960)*

We believe military assistance to our allies under the mutual security program should be continued with all the vigor and funds needed to maintain the strength of our alliances at levels essential to our common safety.

Newly-Emerging Nations

In the Jeffersonian tradition, we recognize and welcome the irresistible momentum of the world revolution of rising expectations for a better life. We shall identify American policy with its values and objectives.

To this end the new Democratic Administration will revamp and refocus the objectives, emphasis and allocation of our foreign assistance programs.

The proper purpose of these programs is not to buy gratitude or to recruit mercenaries, but to enable the peoples of these awakening, developing nations to make their own free choices.

We welcome the emerging new nations of Africa to the world community. Here again we shall strive to write a new chapter of fruitful cooperation.

We reaffirm the Christian's unceasing interest in freedom and self-government for all people. We urge all governments to aid non-self-governing peoples through such educational, medical and technical aid as may assist them to gain independence and to set up stable democratic governments and Christian social practices.

In Latin America, Asia, Africa and the Middle East, peoples of ancient and recent independence have shown their determination to improve their standards of living, and to enjoy an equality with the rest of mankind in the enjoyment of the fruits of civilization. This determination has become a primary fact of their political life. We declare ourselves to be in sympathy with their aspirations.

We have already created unprecedented dimensions of diplomacy for these purposes. We recognize that upon our support of well-conceived programs of economic cooperation among nations rest the best hopes of hundreds of millions of friendly people for a decent future for themselves and their children. We mean to continue in support of them.

We will encourage the countries of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Asia, to initiate appropriate regional groupings to work out plans for economic and educational development.

Immigration

We shall adjust our immigration, nationality and refugee policies to eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united wtih relatives already in our midst.

The national-origins quota system of limiting immigration contradicts the founding principles of this nation. It is inconsistent with our belief in the rights of man.

The revision of immigration and nationality laws we seek will implement our belief that enlightened immigration, naturalization and refugee policies and humane administration of them are important aspects of our foreign policy.

These laws will bring greater skills to our land, reunite families, permit the United States to meet its fair share of world programs of rescue and rehabilitation, and take advantage of immigration as an important factor in the growth of the American economy.

In this World Refugee Year it is our hope to achieve

The General Conference urges Methodists to seek through proper channels of Congress the thorough revision of the McCarran-Walter act, with special attention to the following principles:

1) The latest census instead of that of 1920 should be used as the basis for determining the number of visas to be allowed yearly.

2) The ratios of admissions to this country should also be re-examined and revised in nearer harmony with our current population trends, our current economy and without any bias related to race or national origin. The principal test for admission should be based on individual qualifications which are related to good citizenship.

3) The new law should show no bias toward naturalized citizens, but place them in the same status as native born citizens, except where citizenship was procured by fraud or illegality.

Immigration has been reduced to the point where it does not provide the stimulus to growth that it should, nor are we fulfilling our obligation as a haven for the oppressed. Republican conscience and Republican policy require that:

. . . The annual number of immigrants we accept be at least doubled.

. . . Obsolete immigration laws be amended by abandoning the outdated 1920 census data as a base and substituting the 1960 census.

. . . The guidelines of our immigration policy be based upon judgment of the individual merit of each applicant for admission and citizenship.

admission of our fair share of refugees. We will institute policies to alleviate suffering among the homeless wherever we are able to extend our aid.

We must remove the distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens to assure full protection of our laws to all. There is no place in the United States for "second-class citizenship."

The protection provided by due process, right of appeal, and statutes of limitation, can be extended to non-citizens without hampering the security of our nation.

4) Resident aliens should be given the same protection and benefits accorded U. S. citizens, except for the right to vote and to hold elective office.

5) The admission of visitors should be facilitated and unnecessary embarrassments and delays to which they are subjected should be removed.

6) Provisions should be made for fair hearings and better procedures on appeals under a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization.

7) Provision should be made for an adequate appeal and review procedure without undue delay, on decisions affecting the issuance of visas.

8) Provision should be made for using a percentage of visas for admission of "hard core" cases. (This includes large families, the aged, the physically handicapped and those suffering from long-term diseases.)

9) A clear definition of the grounds for deportation is needed with the probable establishment of a statute of limitations.

10) Regulations governing the admission of foreign visitors for travel, study, conferences, business and similar purposes should be designed to facilitate a freer exchange of visitors.

11) The administration of immigration and naturalization laws and policies should be lodged in one government agency charged only with this responsibility.

12) More generous provision should be made for the admission of refugees displaced because of war or persecution.

DOMESTIC POLICY

The peaceful demonstrations for first-class citizenship which have recently taken place in many parts of this country are a signal to all of us to make good at long last the guarantees of our Constitution.

The time has come to assure equal access for all Americans to all areas of community life, including voting booths, schoolrooms, jobs, housing and public facilities.

Civil Rights: Sit-In Demonstrations

We regret that many citizens of our country are denied basic human rights. The recent wave of sit-in demonstrations and picketing at lunch counters has reminded us of such denials.

We commend participating students for the dignified, non-violent manner in which they have conducted themselves. We further commend the good professional performance of police forces which have prevented chaos in those cities where the demonstrations have occurred. Should such demonstrations continue, we hope that they will be carried out in a similar manner.

We reaffirm the Constitutional right to peaceable assembly to protest discrimination in private business establishments. We applaud the action of the businessmen who have abandoned discriminatory practices in retail establishments, and we urge others to follow their example.

. . . favors such Federal contributions to education as shall be applied exclusively to the aid of tax-supported public schools, on condition that the funds be (1) paid over to agencies of the several states, and administered by them in accordance with their several statutory educational system; (2) allocated according to a formula that moves toward full educational opportunity in the public elementary and secondary schools, in the various sections of the nation, and, within the states, in both urban and rural districts, and for groups of different racial or national origins; (3) safeguarded against the imposition of Federal control in matters of educational policy. *(Excerpts from "Federal Aid to Education" a policy statement adopted by The General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., May 18, 1954)*

Democratic	Church	Republican
Civil Rights: Public School Desegregation		
A new Democratic Administration will also use its full powers—legal and moral—to ensure the beginning of good-faith compliance with the Constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public education. We believe that every school district affected by the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision should submit a plan providing for at least first-step compliance by 1963, the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. To facilitate compliance, technical and financial assistance should be given to school districts facing special problems of transition. For this and for the protection of all other Constitutional rights of Americans, the Attorney General should be empowered and directed to file civil injunction suits in Federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil right on grounds of race, creed or color.	The unanimous decision of the Supreme Court that segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional gives a clear status in law to a fundamental Christian and American principle. It offers the promise of further steps for translating into reality Christian and democratic ideals. The decision is a milestone in the achievement of human rights, another evidence of the endeavor to respect the dignity and worth of all men. Adjustments will be more difficult in some localities than in others. In the period of transition from one pattern to another (whatever the length of the period to be prescribed by the court), we know that the churches and individual Christians will continue to exert their influence and leadership to help the authorized agencies in the several communities to bring about a complete compliance with the decision of the Supreme Court. *(Excerpts from "Supreme Court Decision on Segregation" a policy statement adopted by The General Board of the National Council of The Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., May 19, 1954)*	We pledge: . . . The Department of Justice will continue its vigorous support of court orders for school desegregation. Desegregation suits now pending involve at least 39 school districts. Those suits and others already concluded will affect most major cities in which school segregation is being practiced. . . . It will use the new authority provided by the Civil Rights Act of 1960 to prevent obstruction of court orders. . . . We will propose legislation to authorize the Attorney General to bring actions for school desegregation in the name of the United States in appropriate cases, as when economic coercion or threat of physical harm is used to deter persons from going to court to establish their rights. . . . Our continuing support of the President's proposal, to extend Federal aid and technical assistance to schools which in good faith attempted to desegregate.
Civil Rights: Right to Vote		
The Democratic Administration which takes office next January will therefore use the full powers provided in the Civil Rights Act of 1957 and 1960 to secure for all Americans the right to vote. If these powers, vigorously invoked by a new Attorney General and backed by a strong and imaginative Democratic President, prove inadequate, further powers will be sought. We will support whatever action is necessary to eliminate literacy tests and the payment of poll taxes as requirements for voting.	It is encouraging that a large number of church groups and others have been speaking out against the fact that economic, political and community pressures are being applied to thwart desegregation of the public schools. These pressures deny economic, social and political rights, above all the right to vote, threatening the very foundations of our nation. This General Assembly commits itself, and urges the member churches and all of their constituencies to commit themselves, to strengthen further the efforts and to increase the work of the churches, national, regional, and local, to achieve as soon as possible a non-segregated society. *(Excerpts from "The Churches and Segregation" a policy statement adopted by The General Assembly of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Dec. 5, 1957)*	We pledge: Continued vigorous enforcement of the civil rights laws to guarantee the right to vote to all citizens in all areas of the country; Legislation to provide that the completion of six primary grades in a state accredited school is conclusive evidence of literacy for voting purposes.
Civil Rights: Housing		
Similarly (through the use of its full executive powers) the new Democratic Administration will take action to end discrimination in Federal housing programs, including Federally-assisted housing.	. . . the National Council of Churches commits itself to work through moral suasion, social action and support for the enactment of appropriate housing legislation to achieve the right of every person to acquire housing which permits ". . . a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family . . ." on the basis of personal preference and financial ability without regard to race, national origin, or religion. . . . denominations, local churches, and councils of churches (should) increase their efforts to see that existing governmental programs such as urban redevelopment and urban renewal are so administered as to provide more housing on an open occupancy basis for lower income groups	We pledge: Action to prohibit discrimination in housing constructed with the aid of federal subsidies.

regardless. *(Excerpts from "Non-segregated Housing" a resolution adopted by The General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Feb. 26, 1959)*

Civil Rights: Employment

The new Democratic Administration will support Federal legislation establishing a Fair Employment Practices commission effectively to secure for everyone the right to equal opportunity for employment.

In addition the Democratic Administration will use its full executive powers to assure equal employment opportunities and to terminate racial segregation throughout Federal services and institutions, and on all government contracts.

We recommend that Methodists in their homes, in their work, in their communities actively work to eliminate discrimination and enforced segregation on the basis of race, color or national origin, that as a church we pursue a program of education and action to bring about Christian practices with respect to housing, open occupancy, schools, opportunity of employment and community acceptance which, in the spirit of Christ, create a sense of belonging.

We pledge:

. . . Continued support for legislation to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity to make permanent and to expand with legislative backing the excellent work being performed by the President's Committee on Government Contracts.

. . . Appropriate legislation to end the discriminatory membership practices of some labor union locals, unless such practices are eradicated promptly by the labor unions themselves.

. . . Use of the full-scale review of existing state laws, and of prior proposals for Federal legislation, to eliminate discrimination in employment now being conducted by the Civil Rights commission, for guidance in our objective of developing a Federal-state program in the employment area.

. . . Special consideration of training programs aimed at developing the skills of those now working in marginal agricultural employment so that they can obtain employment in industry, notably in the new industries moving into the South.

Religious and Civil Liberties

With democratic values threatened today by communist tyranny, we reaffirm our dedication to the Bill of Rights. Freedom and civil liberties, far from being incompatible with security, are vital to our national strength.

The Democratic party will strive to improve Congressional investigating and hearing procedures. We shall abolish useless disclaimer affidavits such as those for student educational loans. We shall provide a full and fair hearing, including confrontation of the accuser, to any person whose public or private employment or reputation is jeopardized by a loyalty or security proceeding.

Protection of rights of American citizens to travel, or pursue lawful trade and to engage in other lawful activities abroad without distinction as to race or religion is a cardinal function of the national sovereignty.

We will oppose any international agreement or treaty which by its terms or practices differentiates among American citizens on grounds of race or religion.

We stand for the recognition and maintenance of the rights and responsibilities of free speech, free assembly and a free press, and for the encouragement of free communication of ideas essential to the discovery of truth.

We stand for the right of all individuals and groups to advocate any peaceful and constitutional method for the solution of problems that may confront society. *(Excerpts from "The Social Creed of The Methodist Church" adopted by the General Conference of The Methodist Church, May, 1960)*

We pledge (with specific reference to Israel and the Arab Nations) continued efforts: To secure . . . the cessation of discrimination against Americans on the basis of religious beliefs. . . .

Equality under law promises more than the equal right to vote and transcends mere relief from discrimination by government. It becomes a reality only when all persons have equal opportunity without distinction of race, religion, color or national origin, to acquire the essentials of life—housing, education and employment.

Federal Aid to Education

We believe that America can meet its educational obligations only with generous Federal financial support, within the traditional framework of local control. The assistance will take the form of federal grants to states for education purposes they deem most pressing, including classroom construction and teachers' salaries. It will include aid for the construction of academic facilities as well as dormitories at colleges and universities.

. . . favors such Federal contributions to education as shall be applied exclusively to the aid of tax-supported public schools, on condition that the funds be 1) paid over to agencies of the several states, and administered by them in accordance with their several statutory educational systems; 2) allocated according to a formula that moves toward full educational opportunity in the public elementary and secondary schools, in the various sections of the nation, and, within the states, in both urban and rural districts, and for groups of different racial or national

Toward the goal of fullest possible educational opportunity for every American, we pledge:

Federal support to the primary and secondary schools by a program of Federal aid for school construction — pacing it to the real needs of individual school districts in states and territories, and requiring state approval and participation.

We are aware of the fact that there is a temporary shortage of classrooms for our elementary and secondary schools in a limited number of states. But this shortage, due to the

Democratic

We shall seek to bring the two million men, women and children who work for wages on the farms of the United States under the protection of existing labor and social legislation; and to assure migrant labor, perhaps the most underprivileged of all of a comprehensive program to bring them not only decent wages but also an adequate standard of health, housing, Social Security protection, education and welfare services.

We support a housing construction goal of more than two million homes a year. Most of the increased construction will be priced to meet the housing needs of middle and low income families who now live in substandard housing and are priced out of the market for decent homes.

Our housing programs will provide for rental as well as sales housing. They will permit expanded cooperative housing programs and sharply stepped-up rehabilitation of existing homes.

To make possible the building of two million homes a year in wholesome neighborhoods, the home building industry should be aided by special mortgage assistance, with low interest rates, long-term mortgage periods and reduced down payments. Where necessary, direct government loans should be provided.

Even with this new and flexible approach, there will still be need for a substantial low-rent public housing program authorizing as many units as local communities require and are prepared to build.

Church

origins; 3) safeguarded against the imposition of Federal control in matters of educational policy. *(Excerpts from "Federal Aid to Education" a policy statement adopted by The General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., May 18, 1954)*

Migratory Farm Laborers

Without assuming either responsibility or special competence with regard to the technical details of legislation, we believe that the churches should support measures intended to provide the following: (1) A plan for the effective recruitment, fair employment practices and equitable distribution of seasonal farm laborers; (2) A more effective utilization of domestic seasonal farm labor; (3) The importation of foreign workers only when necessary to supplement the domestic labor supply, with adequate provision made for their welfare; (4) The extension of minimum wage legislation, Social Security benefits and labor legislation to include migratory farm laborers; (5) A federal housing code for migrant camps to set a minimum standard for all states; (6) The regulation of the methods of transportation of workers from area to area and from state to state to insure their safety and humane treatment; (7) The protection of the children of the migratory workers by more effective enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards act as amended in 1950 to make it compulsory for children under 16 to attend school when schools are in session; (8) Improved educational facilities for migratory workers and their children. *(Excerpts from "The Concern of the Churches for Migratory Farm Laborers" a policy statement adopted by The General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Sept. 19, 1951)*

Housing

Means are urgently needed to eliminate substandard housing and to provide a well-designed, well-constructed, and livable house of adequate size in a wholesome community environment for every person. The nation must enlist all its potential strength to solve the critical housing problem. The construction and banking industries, the local, state and Federal governments, the voluntary housing associations and local citizenry must all assume a share of the responsibility to cope adequately with this complex national problem.

Federal aid for housing research and experiments aimed to improve technological operations of the building industry and to find new ways to reduce building cost should be restored.

We also appeal to church members to support all sound and effective measures for a comprehensive national housing program coordinated by one Federal agency, and for the development of well-planned, integrated, and non-segregated residential neighborhoods. *(Excerpts from "The Churches' Concern For Housing" a policy statement adopted by The General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Nov. 18, 1953)*

Republican

vigilant action of state legislatures and local school boards, is not increasing, but is decreasing.

We believe moreover that any large plan of Federal aid to education, such as direct contributions to or grants for teachers' salaries can only lead ultimately to Federal domination and control of our schools to which we are unalterably opposed.

We pledge:

. . . action on these constructive lines: Improvement of job opportunities and working conditions of migratory farm workers.

Recognizing that the Federal government must help provide the economic climate and incentives which make this objective obtainable, the Republican party will vigorously support the following steps, all designed to supplement and not supplant private initiative.

. . . Continued effort to clear slums, and promote rebuilding, rehabilitation and conservation of our cities.

. . . New programs to stimulate development of specialized types of housing, such as those for the elderly and for nursing homes.

. . . A program of research and demonstration aimed at finding ways to reduce housing costs, including support of efforts to modernize and improve local building codes.

. . . Adequate authority for the federal housing agencies to assist the flow of mortgage credit into private housing, with emphasis on homes for middle and lower income families and including assistance in urban residential areas.

. . . A stepped-up program to assist in urban planning, designed to assure far-sighted and wise use of land and to coordinate mass transportation and other vital facilities in our metropolitan areas.

A Symposium on the Religious Issue

"Question: Should the beliefs of a candidate affect our decision in November?"

Yes

by Dr. Herbert Southgate
National Recording Secretary, Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State

This question, of course, has nothing to do with the right of a candidate of any religious faith or of no religious faith to run for President and serve if elected. The Sixth Article to the Constitution precludes any "religious test" such as one finds in a number of the South American and European countries barring certain groups from public office. We have none of that here.

In the matter of assessing how one will vote, however, religion would certainly be a factor of consideration. The Presidency of the United States is a most important office and any factor, including religion, which might affect the candidate's performance as an office-holder should not be overlooked.

Roman Catholic control

The religion of a Roman Catholic candidate is of particular interest because of two facts: (1) the Roman Catholic Church is the only church now operative in the United States which is controlled from abroad, and (2) this church claims authoritarian control over the actions of its members where "moral and spiritual" matters as well as considerations involving the institutional welfare of that church are concerned. What makes this of significance politically is that many matters which are defined by the Roman Catholic Church as "moral and spiritual" happen to be under civil control in a democratic country like ours and therefore are subject to the will of the people. Matters such as marriage, education, birth control, censorship, etc., are instances. The Roman Catholic Church has a definite official line in regard to such matters. What voters want to know is whether a Catholic as President would be bound to follow his church's line, or whether he would act in terms of his oath of office to serve the best interest of his country.

One good example, among many, is offered by the birth control question. Pope Pius XI in 1930 barred birth control for Roman Catholic married couples. In November, 1959, the American Catholic Bishops asserted that their people could not support any government programs, whether domestic or foreign aid, which involved public assistance for birth control. With a population explosion about to blow up the world, this is a public question of the greatest gravity. We would hardly want in the office of President a man bound by a hopelessly medieval and archaic point of view on this important matter. It is simply too late in the day for that.

Another example: One of the famous "Questions for a Catholic Candidate" raised by Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State in 1957 is as follows: "The Canon Law of your church (Canon 1374) directs all American Catholic parents to boycott our public schools unless they have special permission from their bishops. Do you personally approve or disapprove of this boycott rule?"

If someone should argue that these matters are not important and that they should not enter into one's consideration of a candidate, this answer would be indicated—"How silly can you be?"

Ecclesiastical pressures

Yielding to ecclesiastical pressures is a very important matter to church people—attendance at religious services. While this does not involve official duties of the President, it is a type of function which our Presidents have long unofficially fulfilled. President Eisenhower attended the Red Mass of the Roman Catholic Church and many other church functions, Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish, and in so doing lent the high moral force of his Office to the edification of these occasions. Most of us believe that this is good.

Hierarchy control

In 1950 Senator Kennedy, then a member of the House, had been invited to appear at an inter-faith banquet in Philadelphia honoring the four chaplains, Protestant, Catholic and Jew, who went down on the U.S.S. Dorchester during World War II. Kennedy agreed to come, had his name printed on the program, had his address ready for delivery, then suddenly cancelled his appearance. The reason, as he himself acknowledged to his host, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, was that Dennis Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia had requested that he not appear. We know that under Canon Law 1258 Cardinal Dougherty was within the asserted rights of the hierarchy to control the behavior of Catholics at such a point as this. They may not attend Protestant or other services of religion without special permission of the hierarchy.

Senator Kennedy has offered the explanation for this strange behavior that he felt he had no right to represent the Roman Catholic Church unless authorized to do so. This is not an explanation which will impress Protestants. Dr. Poling has concluded: "I have studied his statements with understandable concern, especially his view that a man's reli-

(continued on page 14)

(continued from page 13)

gion is a private matter and that nothing should take precedence over an office-holder's oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. . . . Today, though I respectfully read what Senator Kennedy has to say, one thing in his record is unmistakably clear. The church did claim and exercise authority over him while he was in high public office. . . . At least once, John Kennedy of Massachusetts submitted, apparently against his own inclinations and better judgment, to its dictates."

Justifiable apprehension

Many instances of this kind of "conflict of interest" could be cited. This is enough to justify some apprehension by Protestants where a Roman Catholic candidate is concerned. Why should not such considerations have some effect on their decision in the polling booth?

Then, there is another matter. Some of the infallible papal encyclicals regarding religious freedom are pretty grim so far as Protestants are concerned. The "Syllabus of Errors" is a good example. If such statements are to be taken at their face value, Protestants could hope for very little in a culture dominated by Roman Catholic clericalism. Indeed. instances of harassment and oppression of Protestants by Catholic-dominated regimes are extant in the world today. Now we are being told to pay no attention to such things, that the encyclicals really do not mean what they say, and that American is "different."

Affirmative answer

These are weighty considerations as they pertain to a candidate of Roman Catholic Faith. We are interested in the connections of any candidate for President. If he is a member of organized labor or the N.A.M. or the veterans, or the communists, or what not, we certainly want to know how much such ties will determine his performance in office. Concern over a man's religious association is fully as vital at this point. I certainly do not say that this is the sole consideration in the appraisal of a Presidential candidate. But the question here, "Should the religious belief of a candidate for the Presidency of the United States affect our decision in November?" should be answered definitely in the affirmative.

No

Excerpts from remarks of Theodore C. Sorensen, Assistant to Sen. John F. Kennedy, on "The Catholic Issue in American Politics" presented in February, 1960.

I do not object to questioning our Presidential candidates. They ought to be questioned—thoroughly questioned—on the great decisions the next President must face.

Any voter who cares only about what church the candidate attends on Sunday—is throwing his vote away—he's performing a dangerous act, a stupid act.

I do not object to legitimate questions being raised—and there are legitimate questions touching on religion, for all candidates. The issues of public education, an Ambassador to the Vatican, our relations with such nations as Spain or Colombia, our own religious liberties and traditional separation of church and state, even the use of our foreign aid for birth control—these are legitimate questions because they involve *public* policy. No one should feel bigoted about raising them—and no candidate for public office should feel persecuted if he is asked them. It is unfortunate, in fact, that all of our potential Presidential nominees have not answered these questions with equal candor.

Are Catholics second class Americans?

I do not intend to ever apologize for any Catholic candidate's religious faith and upbringing. Why oppose a man because he goes to church—his church?

. . . *I want* a man in the White House who has a conscience—whose upbringing has taught him, either in religious or moral terms, to feel compassion for his fellow men—to reject deception and hypocrisy—to abhor war and senseless killing. I *want* a man who believes in the Golden Rule—who feels shame and indignation over the fate of those 17 million Americans who go to bed hungry every night—or the six million American children who live in the overcrowded hovels that breed delinquency and disease. I *want* a man in the White House who has been taught to believe in the dignity of human life, in the brotherhood of all mankind. And I would prefer a President whose church affiliation (or lack of it) was a part of his traditional private life—and not a showcase for the nation, or a sudden inspiration after he reached the White House.

I do not want anyone to vote for a Catholic merely because he *is* a Catholic—or merely to show that we are *not* prejudiced. But if a Catholic is rejected in this country on religious grounds, what then would be the effect on our image abroad—on such leaders as DeGaulle, Adenauer, Diem, Frondizi and all the rest (not one of whom, as far as I know, has ever exhibited a dual allegiance to the Vatican, even in those countries where Catholics are a majority)? Are we to say to the world that this is no longer a haven for the victims of religious persecution? Are we going to admit to the world that a Jew can be elected Mayor of Dublin, a Protestant can be chosen Foreign Minister of France, a Moslem can serve in the Israeli Parliament—but a Catholic cannot be President of the United States? Are we to tell Chancellor Adenauer, for example, that we want him risking his all on our front-lines, but that—

if he were an American—we would never entrust him with our Presidency? Are we to admit to the world that one-third of our population is forever barred from the White House?

What happens then to the first Amendment to the Constitution, intended to assure religious liberty and equality for all Americans? What happens then to the Sixth Article of that Constitution, intended to prevent any religious test from ever being imposed for Federal office?

Can a Catholic Win?

A Catholic can serve in any position of trust to which this nation elects him. Whether or not the nation does elect him—whether or not his religion is a practical bar or handicap—is a different and a political question. It can only be answered by the voters themselves. But I would emphasize three points:

1) 1960 is not 1928. Al Smith bore the handicaps of being from Tammany Hall and the east side of New York, of being a Wet in a Dry year, and, above all, of being a Democrat in a Republican year. As a Catholic he faced a country far less urbanized, far less educated and far less sophisticated and tolerant than the country is today.

2) Without question there are some areas where religion will be a handicap—in the deep South, where in all probability it cannot affect the electoral vote—in parts of New England and the Middle West, where voters usually equate Protestantism with Republicanism anyway . . . And in some areas, a Catholic candidate's religion, just as unfortunately, will be a real asset—and those areas *are* somewhat more important politically. But the point is that any nominee will have certain handicaps and certain assets.

3) When every candidate is better known, when an actual contest with a real opponent is underway, there will be less emphasis on "the Catholic candidate." I'm not sure I would vote for "the Catholic candidate" for President.

I say this is going to be a key year in the American struggle for religious equality and tolerance—perhaps the most decisive year of our life-time. We may never have such an opportunity again. Everyone in this audience ought to be in the fore-front of that struggle—answering the bigots, informing the ignorant, rallying the people around the banner of brotherhood. Surely we do not belong on the other side of the struggle—adding to the confusion, giving ammunition to the hate-mongers, or preaching disunity.

We can no longer afford to deny—for irrevelant and insignificant and irrational reasons—our nation's leadership to any man who is best qualified to lead us. We cannot—we dare not—elect an inferior man—or a minority party—for reasons not based on fact—spreading bitter disunity through a land that needs unity now as never before—and blotting and blemishing our image to a world whose respect we need now as never before.

Maybe

An official statement of the Board of Social and Economic Relations of The Methodist Church, now the Division of Human Relations and Economic Affairs of The General Board of Christian Social Concerns.

Whether or not a Roman Catholic is to be elected President is only one of many issues confronting responsible political activity in 1960. The resolution of this issue makes no one exempt from facing the many other important issues at stake. This issue has to be seen as only one within the context of the many issues that have to be considered regarding a man's qualification for the highest political office in the United States. In fact, it might be possible for a candidate to hold views on the separation of church and state which are acceptable to most citizens and yet be unqualified for the Presidency for other reasons.

"Likewise, it is possible that a candidate might hold unacceptable views on church-state relations, yet on other issues he could be so far more qualified than his opponent that he would be the 'lesser of two evils.' Political decisions are sometimes of this sort.

"Methodists do uphold the principles and rights found in the Constitution. Because of this, we do not treat lightly the Constitutional prohibition of a religious test for public office. It is repugnant both to such democratic principles as well as to God who is no 'respecter of persons' to use a man's religious commitment, or lack of it, as a sole test to either qualify or disqualify a man for political office. It is repugnant to have a voter either accept or reject a candidate by the simple test of his religious convictions.

"From a moral standpoint, this same standard of criticism applies to a political party which is willing to run or not run a man for public office because his religion may or may not secure votes.

"Many other aspects of a candidate's life must be weighed in any wise determination of his fitness for public office. For example his political integrity: how he votes on issues, to whom he is indebted for his present leadership, what power groups support him and to whom he might be obligated are all matters of more political importance than the matter of his personal religious affiliations.

(continued on page 16)

(continued from page 15)

"Other qualifications would include: his educational background, his experience, his record as an appointed and elected official, his competence in the broad administration of the many complex and crucial affairs that are part of our national and international life and his ability to resist objectionable pressures from power groups—whether these be economic, political, military or religious (his own or others).

"Though a man's religion does not disqualify him for high public office, there may be aspects of the religious faith he professes which the voter would consider detrimental to public policy if the candidate held to this aspect of his religious life.

"Other traditions which include certain strong beliefs about Sunday observance, working on Saturday or views on health, might cause voters to question any candidate with these traditions, regarding how they would affect the leadership, or lack of it, he might give to such matters as Sunday 'blue' laws, working on Saturday and public health.

"It is the responsibility of Christian citizens to inquire seriously, but without religious bigotry or intolerance, concerning the bearing of a candidate's religious views upon his decisions in public office. It is important to distinguish clearly between the excellent personal qualities of Roman Catholics as individuals, including such as may become candidates for the Presidency, and the official position of the Roman Catholic Church in relation to the state.

"It must be recognized that in disputed matters, such as birth control or the public support of parochial schools, this church expects its members to adhere to its position not only in private life but in matters of public concern.

"While all citizens may at times be subject to conflicting political and religious loyalties, a conscientious Roman Catholic because of the authoritarian nature of the demands of his church is subject to such conflicts to a degree that other citizens are not. This fact should be recognized without religious bigotry, without animus against any individual, and without regarding religious connection as the sole determining factor in voting for a candidate for office.

"At the same time we need to consider two important refinements of this problem:

"1) There are many Roman Catholics, who, though loyal to their religious heritage in many ways, do not follow fully the official view of their church on many of the issues that concern us. Within the United States this is especially true and we would wish to both recognize and encourage honest diversity within the Roman Catholic Church when it is based on truthful inquiry. This includes the many Roman Catholics, some in high places, who have openly accepted the concept of the separation of church and state as provided in the Constitution.

"2) It is entirely possible that a Protestant or non-Roman Catholic in office might be less capable of resisting unwise positions of the Roman Catholic Church than would be a Roman Catholic office holder. A historic example of this in recent years is the fact that Protestants have some times closely reflected official Roman Catholic views regarding an Ambassador to the Vatican. Because of this we believe it imperative that all candidates, whether or not Roman Catholic, be questioned carefully on the official positions of the Roman Cathtlic Church which affect public policy.

"Among the questions which we believe should legitimately be asked all Presidential candidates, and candidates for other offices which involve decisions on these issues, related to policies of the Roman Catholic Church are the following:

"1) Many nations recognize the Vatican City of the Roman Catholic Church as both church and state and send official Ambassadors to the Holy See. If you become President, what would be your policy concerning the appointment of an ambassador from the United States or a personal representative to the Vatican?

"2) Pope Pius IX, in the Syllabus of Errors, condemned the concept of the separation of church and state. Do you accept this position of the Roman Catholic Church or the American principle of the separation of church and state as provided for in the Constitution?

"3) The Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States issued an official statement in 1948, which took issue with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the First Amendment, as it relates to the separation of church and state. The statement claims that the Constitution permits the "cooperation between government and religions." It implies, among other things, the use of tax money for sectarian or parochial schools, provided this is done equally with "no preference of one religion over another." What is your personal attitude toward the Bishops' interpretation of the Constitution? What is your attitude toward the plan of financing parochial schools with public funds by scholarship grants to parents of children in such schools at the elementary and secondary levels?

"4) As our chief executive, would you support the use of public funds for dissemination of birth control information and materials when requested by other nations facing overpopulation? Would you continue to support the granting of federal funds to hospitals in the United States which disseminate birth control information?

"If a candidate answers these questions frankly and in accord with the convictions of the many citizens concerned about the principles of the separation of church and state, and if he is also qualified in terms of the many other issues and abilities needed for the office, then it is conceivable for a responsible person to support such a candidate whether he be Roman Catholic, Protestant, or neither."

Will you 'blow your ballot?'

by James A. Hamilton

Associate Director, Washington Office, National Council of Churches

Most party people are happy with the candidates selected by their nominating conventions in July. They see in the nominee of their party a man "destined" to lead their party and the nation at a crucial point of history.

Others are not so pleased. There is a curious question on the minds of some of the party faithful and many independents about both Presidential nominees, Richard Milhous Nixon and John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

It is curious because both Senator Kennedy and Vice President Nixon were nominated on the first ballot cast at the convention of their respective parties. Moreover, it is a question raised not only by independent voters and observers, but by partisan Democrats and Republicans. And about the candidate of their own party, not just the opposing nominee.

It is a question stimulated perhaps in part by each candidate's not-so-humble asknowledgement that now is the time for "greatness". It is perhaps a natural reaction by those who would have preferred another candidate for one of the nominations.

Perhaps, after all the talk about the gravity of the times and the necessity for the United States to supply well-qualified leadership, it is a result of the realization that each convention nominated a young man, skilled, they suspect, primarily in the art of political manipulation.

Whatever the reasoning, the question for many people is "How do you choose between Kennedy and Nixon?" Or, a potentially more harmful question, "Why try to choose between them?"

Personality assistance

Some people say that President Eisenhower was elected on the strength of his personality. The remainder admit that his personality didn't hurt him. If as a people we do vote somewhat from the heart, it may be the more emotional among us who are chilled by the prospect of having to choose between the two 1960 candidates. For many believe that the choice is between two cool operators, automat politicians, each of whom has shown himself innately capable of saying and doing the right thing at the right time, yet lacks the human warmth, genuineness and principled convictions which usually mark a "natural" leader of men and nations.

Issues aside, they say, compare the cool, calculated, well-manicured offerings of Kennedy with the sometimes more hesitant, warmed-up, yet just as carefully studied phrases of Nixon. Brushed aside is the unemotional fact that there may be some little virtue in a man thinking before he speaks, particularly a man running for the Presidency of the United States. Rushing ahead in their comparison of the candidates "on their merits" they ask you to judge the quick boyish grin of one candidate against the somewhat slower, but they point out, no less automatic smile of his opponent.

Dangers apparent

There are two dangers inherent in this flip-a-coin, petal-picking approach to the selection of the next President of the United States.

The first is that a significant portion of the electorate may "sit-out" the November election adopting a sort of "plague on both candidates" attitude. Just what purpose such a protest vote might serve is difficult to understand. Failure to exercise what we claim as a precious right would seem to be the grossest type of irresponsibility.

The second potential danger in the "fuzzy approach" lurks around those who will vote, but not out of any basic conviction about the man or the issues. In seeking some semblance of a reason upon which to hang their vote, there is always the possibility of moving from the irrelevant to the reprehensible.

It is impossible to justify religious prejudice. Smear tactics directed at one who is alleged to have used them are also culpable.

Yet those who refuse to sit down and rationally study the candidates and their positions represent fertile soil for those who would sow the seeds of prejudice and the half-truth.

Informed voters

There is evidence that the November election will be a real horse race. Political pollsters and observers see the result as being very close whoever should win. One of the candidates has said it will be the closest election of this century.

Given the Democratic party which is anxious to return to power, the Republican party which wants to stay in power and two in-fighters who can shell it out on a toe-to-toe basis, you have the ingredients for a real knock-down, drag-out battle. They underline the necessity for voters becoming informed as to the real issues involved in the contest. Unfortunately, the voter may not be able to look to the candidates for too much help in the development of real issues.

Take the Democratic candidate's charge that his Republican opponent is devoid of "basic belief." Though it may remind some of an old saw, something about one kitchen pan commenting on the color of another, it

(continued on page 18)

(continued from page 17)

tends to resurrect for others the image which many Democrats have tried so hard to develop for Nixon, the image of a man who can't quite be trusted.

The incident which triggered Senator Kennedy's charge that Vice President Nixon lacked "basic beliefs" was Nixon's repudiation of Secretary of Agriculture Benson and the Benson farm program. The Democratic nominee charged, "The record of the past speaks far more eloquently than any new positions taken for the purpose of a political campaign."

These are strange words to fall from the lips of a man who, up until he entered the race for his party's nomination for the Vice Presidency in 1956 and changed his position overnight, had voted for Benson's flexible price support program.

Of course, to hang this kind of horseshoe around the neck of either nominee would be to deny that a man can "grow" in his work. Experience should count for something, and if a politician can't learn and thereby change his mind, we would soon find ourselves victims of a consistent, though erroneous, position.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that both Presidential candidates have their share of skeletons in the closet. And the choice is not between one platform which is white and another which is black, but between shades of gray.

Existing differences

This is not to say that there are no differences between the candidates and their positions on issues. The differences exist and they are important. The responsibility of the voter is to ferret out these differences, study and discuss the men and the issues and make his own conscious, positive choice on the basis of the facts.

It will not be an easy, ready-mixed, just-add-water task. It will be necessary to cut through the haze and smoke of battle. Take for instance, Nixon's charge that Kennedy "paid the price" for the support he received from labor. There is no evidence of any "deal." What "price"?

Nixon could not prove his charge, yet the innuendo was sufficient to "confirm" the fear present in some minds that Kennedy may be a "tool" of organized labor. In fact, organized labor has for years endorsed, for the most part, Democratic candidates and programs and it is doubtful whether Kennedy found it necessary this year to "purchase" such support.

Or take the statement in Senator Kennedy's acceptance speech in which he charges that Nixon's "political career has often seemed to show charity toward none and malice for all." Here is another generalized charge offered without substantiation, and ripe with innuendo.

It is going to be a hard-fought campaign, and it will be up to the voters to demand that the debaters stick to the issues and provide the evidence. The individual must guard against campaigners who would destroy his judgement, his right to make a free and clear decision, by appealing to prejudice or engaging in character assassination.

Politics may be a great American game, but it is also a challenge of serious consequences to all Americans. The citizen who considers politics beneath his dignity or consideration deprives himself of his only opportunity to share in governing himself.

In the final analysis, the voter who is fooled and the citizen who is badly governed have only themselves to blame. In the realization of this fact rest our hopes for a better United States, and a better World.

TO: *Contact-Concern,* 100 Maryland Avenue Northeast, Washington 2, D.C.

Please send me _____ copies of the special Election Issue for local distribution.

(Twenty-five cents per single copy, $25.00 per 100)
I enclose _____ in cash to cover this order.

Orders over $5 may be billed. If you wish to be billed instead of sending cash check here _____.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

What Can One Christian and/or One Church Do?

by Lee A. Ranck
Director, Washington Area Methodist Information

In July a flick of the television switch brought to millions of Americans a "best-seat-in-the-house" view of the Democratic and Republican conventions.

How many of these spectators saw the convention as more than a television show? Were they confused by the political complexities, indifferent because of the similarities of candidates and their platforms, or simply apathetic? Did they realize that they could and should play an important part in the approaching election?

How many of these spectators were concerned Christians who still wondered: "Just what can I do anyway?"

Throughout September and October, the nominees and their parties will appeal for the November vote in every state in the union. No one can tell a Christian how to vote, but here are some things that he might do to help himself and others make the right decisions:

1) Study the election issues. Christian responsibility in this election year includes an understanding of the issues and how they affect the world. Today these issues are not simply domestic or international, and voters must realize that whatever happens in the United States or anywhere affects the whole world. Each conscientious voter will examine and attempt to understand the major issues so that he can choose the President who will face them most adequately.

Some of these major issues are civil rights, emerging nations, cold war and disarmament problems, education and welfare, economic policies, inflation — taxes — balanced budget, or developing institutions for peaceful change.

2) Study the point of view of the nominees and their parties. Nominees will present their views through television, radio and personal appearances or in newspaper and magazine articles. Both parties have stated and published their platforms. For an introduction and comparison of the party platforms see the article starting on page five of this issue.

3) Study the candidate's qualifications. Christians need to know the man who gets their vote. Party offices across the nation have detailed biographies of candidates. Articles in most of the national magazines have presented and will present the backgrounds, successes and failures of each of the nominees.

4) Share opinions on nominees and issues. Christian responsibility includes the expression of informed opinions and convictions. Write "Letters to the Editor" and use other means of communication. This Christian opinion will oppose religious bigotry or campaign smears, and will help to develop honest, informed public opinion among friends and neighbors.

5) Form a group in the home or church to discuss the campaign. During the next two months, a Christian might initiate an election program to take the place of a scheduled meeting of the WSCS, Young Adults, bridge club or bowling team. Someone has to keep people thinking about the campaign and their responsibility in it.

(continued on page 20)

(continued from page 19)

6) Send for, study, and distribute the special "Election Packet" prepared by the General Board of Christian Social Concerns. It contains 12 pieces of literature relevant to the election. Get it from the board, 100 Maryland Avenue, Northeast, Washington 2, D. C.; $1.00.

7) Help in a campaign to see that every member of the church and community is well informed and registered and plans to go to the polls. Civic groups in the community and the WSCS, Methodist Men, or Young Adults could sponsor this campaign.

8) Pray for the nominees and voters. Since prayer is also a Christian responsibility, ask God to bless and guide the election.

What a church can do

Christians have always found strength in the fellowship of the church, which also is a vital part of the election. No church should openly support a party or nominee, but it should provide opportunities for its members to become informed and should stimulate them to responsible action. Here are some things that a church or church group can do to prepare for the election in November (and the spark plug for any of these actions should be the CSC committee):

1) Provide materials for members and church groups to use for study and discussion. Place these materials in church literature racks. The "Election Packet" by the Board of Christian Social Concerns offers a variety of material concerned with the campaign. Included in the packet are articles on fair play in politics, election issues, Christian responsibility, a Roman Catholic for President, and the social creed of The Methodist Church. Other materials can be obtained from party headquarters, articles in national magazines, or the publications of The Methodist Church and other denominations.

2) Distribute these materials to church school classes, youth groups, committees, circles, the WSCS, Methodist Men, and other church groups. Urge them to plan special programs, discussion groups, or campaigns.

3) Set aside time usually spent on religious instruction for study and discussion of the election. Christian public action, after all, is a part of the life of the church. One Sunday,

church school teachers might prepare for a discussion of the election, or a guest speaker could address the church school. Sunday evening services might become a vital discussion period. Even the mid-week prayer service could be used for a prayerful discussion of the issues and nominees.

4) Prepare church school teachers to relate lessons to the election. Teachers could gather for one or more sessions to discuss and study the campaign in preparation for relating it to Biblical lessons.

5) Sponsor a series of programs aimed at presenting the issues, party platforms, candidates' qualifications, and other aspects of the election. For example, a series of five sessions might include topics such as "Major Issues Facing the People and the Government of the United States," "Methodism's Stand and Party Platforms," "The Candidates, Qualifications and Records," "Fair Campaign Practices," and "The Christian Responsibility."

Leaders can develop a variety of interesting programs. Ask local party members or public officials to speak about the campaign; form panel groups; develop debate teams to thrash out platforms and issues; arrange for youth groups to write and present skits about campaigning, voting rights, and so forth.

6) If a series of programs is impossible, one session is better than none. Plan ahead and publicize this program. Pass out materials and urge members to prepare for the discussion at the coming program. Prepare a program that will stimulate a maximum amount of thinking among the participants.

During the next two months, Christians will use every means possible to prepare to choose men who will give the necessary leadership to the United States as it faces the crucial issues of this era. Fulfilling their Christian responsibility, they will cast their votes confidently.

Place your order now for **Election Packet,** a special packet assembled by the staff of the new Board of Christian Social Concerns. Order from Service Department, 100 Maryland Avenue, Northeast, Washington 2, D. C. or from Literature headquarters, Woman's Division of Christian Service, 7820 Reading Road, Cincinnati 37, Ohio, at $1 per packet.

The packet contains the official statements of the General Conference of The Methodist Church on current issues; the Social Creed; a statement of the general board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. on "Christian Responsibility in the 1960 Elections;" a statement of the former Board of Social and Economic Relations, "Should a Roman Catholic Be Elected President;" and guidance material on the use of the packet in studying issues, candidates and party platforms.

I enclose _____ in cash to cover this order.

Orders over $5 may be billed. If you wish to be billed instead of sending cash check here _____.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____